

Disposition of Claims

In response to the non-final summary action dated 11/25/2005, **Disposition of Claims 4)** Claims pending in the application, please amend the above patent as follows:

Page 18, Claim 2


2. A variable point generation craps game, comprising:
 - a random indicator generator, said random indicator being capable of generating only members of a predetermined set of card indicators; wherein said special deck of card comprises 36 standard playing cards, said 36 cards being in groups as follows: 1 "two" of diamonds; 2 "threes" one heart, one spade; 3 "fours" one diamond, one club, one heart; 4 "fives" two hearts, one spade, one club; 5 "sixes" one diamond, one spade, one club, two hearts; 6 "sevens" two hearts, two clubs, two spades, 5 "eights" one diamond, one club, one spade, two hearts; 4 "nines" one spade, one club, two hearts, 3 "tens" one diamond, one heart, one spade; 2 Aces, one heart, one spade; 1 Face Card of diamonds, each of said cards having an assigned point values as shown on said card with each "Ace" having a point value of eleven and each "Face Card" having a point value of twelve, each of said point values providing a point for said craps game;
 - at least one point value selector;
 - each of said set of predetermined card indicators designating a predetermined operation of at least one of said point value selectors, each of said point value selectors has an initial state providing all possible point values obtainable from a single roll of a standard pair of dice, said point values being available from point value selector with the same probability as from said standard pair of dice;
 - said predetermined operation of each of said point value selectors yielding at least one point for said craps game upon designation by said random indicator generator; and a bet, said bet depending upon at least one card point value by at least one of said point value selectors.

Disposition of Claims 6) Claims rejected. In response to 35 U.S.C 102(B), in light of the amendment as stated above, the point is moot and therefore not in conflict with 102.


Dated: January 17, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Alireza Pirouzkhan

By:


Susan L. Melendez